ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE CORRELATE 2 – CLASSROOM EVALUATION/ASSESSMENT

Correlate 2: The school utilizes multiple evaluation and assessment strategies to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
2.1 EVALUATION/ ASSESSMENT	Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:			
2.1a **Classroom assessments of student learning are frequent, rigorous and aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards.**	All assessments are aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards; a number of these assessments are also interdisciplinary and multi-modal.	**All assessments are aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards.**	Some assessments are aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards, but some are based on other content (e.g., textbooks).	Assessments are not aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards.
Examples of Supporting Evidence: • Units of study, lesson plans • School board policy • Samples of classroom assessments • Samples of student work products • Student and staff member interviews • Walk-through observations	School leaders and other staff members develop and implement a systematic, school-wide classroom assessment program to ensure continuous student progress.	**The school board adopts a classroom assessment policy and school leadership implements procedures to ensure that classroom assessments are frequent, through a variety of means, and consistently used to ensure continuous student progress.**	School board classroom assessment policy addresses classroom assessments, but either the policy does not require frequent assessments or procedures are not implemented by school leadership requiring the assessments to be used to ensure continuous student progress.	School board policy does not address classroom assessments.
	Teacher-designed assessment tasks are standards-based, rigorous, authentic and integrated across content areas.	**Teacher-designed assessment tasks are intentionally standards-based, rigorous and authentic requiring students to use inquiry, problem- solving and higher-order critical thinking skills at a proficient level.**	Teacher-designed assessments are not always rigorous and/or authentic. The assessments do not always elicit proficient student work.	Teacher-designed assessments are neither rigorous nor authentic.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
2.1b **Teachers collaborate in the design of authentic assessment tasks aligned with the standards and relevant to the school culture.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Samples of assessments • Montana's Content and Performance Standards • Staff member interviews • Lesson plans • Professional resource materials	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	All teachers within and across all content areas collaborate to design appropriate authentic assessment tasks that are aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards informed by current research.	**Teachers intentionally and regularly collaborate to design appropriate authentic assessment tasks (e.g., exhibits, videos, story boards) that are aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards.**	Teachers sometimes collaborate to design authentic assessment tasks, but the assessments are not always aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards.	Teachers rarely collaborate to design authentic assessment tasks and the assessments are not aligned with Montana's Content and Performance Standards.
	Students and teachers collaborate to design a variety of assessment tasks that require students to provide valid and appropriate demonstrations of what the students should know and be able to do.	**All assessment tasks require valid and appropriate demonstrations of what students should know and be able to do. Students are provided choice from a range of forms for assessment.**	Some assessment tasks require valid and appropriate demonstrations of what students should know and be able to do. Students are not always provided choice in forms of assessment.	Assessment tasks do not require valid and appropriate demonstrations of what students should know and be able to do.
	School and district leaders model and participate in the collaborative design of assessment tasks.	**The collaborative design of assessment tasks is ongoing and regularly reviewed with school leadership; appropriate feedback is provided to teachers.**	The collaborative design of assessment tasks is reviewed with school leadership, but feedback is not provided to teachers.	The collaborative design of assessment tasks is neither ongoing nor reviewed with school leadership.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
2.1c **Students can articulate the academic expectations in each class and know what is required to be proficient.** <u>**Examples of Supporting Evidence**</u>**:** • Student, staff member and parent/ family member interviews • Rubrics • Student work with rubrics and identified performance expectations identified in common skill areas • Student journals/learning logs • Classroom displays • Walk-through observations • Student Performance Level Descriptions • Perception surveys • Student questionnaire data	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	Teachers collaborate with students and other teachers to develop clearly defined rubrics for skills and processes to assess what students know and are able to do to be proficient in all content areas.	**Teachers collaborate to develop and use clearly defined rubrics for skills and processes to assess what students know and are able to do to be proficient in all content areas.**	Some teachers collaborate to develop clearly defined rubrics to assess what students know and are able to do to be proficient in some content areas.	Teachers do not collaborate on the development of clearly defined rubrics that provide clear content and performance expectations for students.
	Students can articulate what they should know and be able to do to be proficient in all content areas and they can demonstrate connections among academic disciplines.	**Students can articulate what they should know and be able to do to be proficient in each content area. Students can describe the characteristics of quality work.**	Some students can articulate what they should know and be able to do to be proficient in each content area.	Students cannot articulate what they should know and be able to do to be proficient.
	Students intentionally reflect upon, evaluate, identify areas for improvement in and modify their own performances. Students can communicate these concepts to teachers, parents and peers in student-led conferences. Students understand their individual learning goals.	**Students reflect upon and formally evaluate their own performances. Students share their self-evaluations with teachers and peers. Students understand their individual learning goals.**	Students reflect upon their work, but do not formally evaluate their own performances.	Students neither reflect upon nor evaluate their own work.
	Report cards communicate to student and families the student's progress towards achievement at expected outcomes aligned to the student's individual growth plan.	**Report cards communicate to students and families the student's progress towards achievement of expected outcomes.**	Report cards communicate to students and families.	Report cards aren't informative.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
2.1d **Test scores are used to identify curriculum gaps.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • 5YCEP • Student Performance Level Descriptions • Classroom evaluation data • Protocols for analyzing student work • Appropriate committee meeting minutes • Career and technical education profile	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	The practice of the school ensures a clear process for the ongoing analysis of assessment data from multiple sources to identify curricular issues and gaps.	**The school board, school staff members and other stakeholders conduct ongoing analysis of the results of multiple assessments, disaggregating the data to determine gaps in the curriculum and instructional implications.**	School staff members analyze the results of a single assessment or desegregations of the data to identify curricular gaps or have only partially identified instructional implications.	School staff members do not conduct a curricular gap analysis.
	The school board, school staff members and other stakeholders monitor the implementation of curricular, instructional and assessment modification and provide assistance and support to ensure that the implementation effort is sustained.	**The school board, school staff members and other stakeholders use the results of data analysis to modify curricular, instructional and assessment practices as needed for all students and sub-groups.**	School staff members use the results of data analysis.	School staff members do not use the results of data analysis.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
2.1e **Multiple assessments are specifically designed to provide meaningful feedback on student learning instructional purposes.** <u>**Examples of Supporting Evidence**</u>: • 5YCEP • Open-response questions, culminating events/performance tasks/projects, teacher developed tests with accompanying scoring guides • Documentation of professional development days/release time • Units of study/lesson plans and the accompanying assessment tasks • Staff member and student interviews • Student questionnaire data	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	There are opportunities for students to design ways to demonstrate learning based on multiple intelligences and preferred learning styles.	**There are multiple opportunities for students to choose ways in which they demonstrate learning based on multiple intelligences and preferred learning styles.**	There are occasional opportunities for students to choose ways in which they demonstrate learning based on multiple intelligences and preferred learning styles.	There is no opportunity for students to choose ways in which they demonstrate learning.
	Multiple forms of classroom assessments are analyzed by instructional staff members and students to determine necessary instructional modifications that will ensure student learning at the proficient level across content areas.	**Multiple forms of classroom assessments are analyzed to determine necessary instructional modifications (e.g., resources, timeframes for learning, lesson plans, and units of study) that will ensure student learning at the proficient level.**	There is a limited variety of classroom assessment tasks and they are only occasionally analyzed to determine necessary instructional modifications.	Classroom assessment tasks are not analyzed for impact on instruction.
	Students and families receive meaningful, ongoing feedback from a variety of sources (e.g., staff members, family members, peers) on their performances and use the feedback to continuously strengthen future performances.	**Students and families receive feedback that is relevant, regular and applicable from teachers. Students are encouraged to use the feedback to continuously strengthen future performances.**	Students do not always receive meaningful feedback that enables them to improve future performances.	Students receive no meaningful feedback on their performances.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
2.1f **Performance standards are clearly communicated, evident in classrooms and observable in student work.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Example of assessment tasks with rubrics and student work. • Student performance models • Teacher and student interviews • Rubrics posted in classrooms • Student Performance Level Descriptions	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	Teachers use performance standards and performance level descriptions to collaborate with students and other teachers to develop clearly defined rubrics prior to assignments/assessments.	**Teachers use performance standards and performance level descriptions to develop clearly defined rubrics that are shared with students prior to assignments/assessments.**	Teachers occasionally use performance standards and performance level descriptions to develop clearly defined rubrics and/or the rubrics are seldom shared with students.	Performance standards and performance level descriptions are not used to develop rubrics and/or rubrics are not shared with students.
	Models of actual student performances and teacher-developed examples are shared across content areas and grade levels. School leadership provides support to teachers to ensure school-wide implementation of strategies to improve student performance.	**Models of actual student performances and teacher-made examples are used to clarify the task and to show distinctions between the levels of performance. Strategies for improving student performance are regularly identified, discussed, implemented in the classroom and observable in student work.**	Models of actual student performances and teacher-made examples are occasionally used to clarify the task and to show distinctions in the levels of performance. Strategies for improving student performance are identified and discussed, but are not always implemented in the classroom or observable in student work.	Models of student performances are not used to clarify the task or to show the distinctions in the levels of performance.
	Teachers, students and other instructional staff members collaborate to design classroom assessment tasks across content areas that allow students to demonstrate characteristics of rigorous work as described in performance standards and the performance level descriptions.	**Classroom assessment tasks allow students to demonstrate characteristics of rigorous work as described in performance standards and the performance level descriptions.**	Classroom assessment tasks sometimes allow students to demonstrate characteristics of rigorous work as described in performance standards and the performance level descriptions.	Classroom assessment tasks do not allow students to demonstrate characteristics of rigorous work as described in performance standards and the performance level descriptions.
	Student assessment tasks are designed to be age and developmentally appropriate and are designed with input from the students.	**Student assessment tasks are designed to be age and developmentally appropriate.**	Student assessment tasks are not always designed to be age and developmentally appropriate.	Student assessment tasks are not designed to be age and developmentally appropriate.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
DA **2.1g** **Implementation of the state-required Assessment Program is coordinated by school and district leadership.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Local board of education policies • Testing schedules • Examples of communications about the state assessment • Staff member, student and parent/ family member interviews • Individual Education Plans/504 Plan/ Program Services Plans • School Report Card	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	School/district leadership has a process for ongoing monitoring and assistance for the ethical administration of the state's assessment and accountability system.	**School/district leadership provides training on the administration of and ethical procedures for the state assessment program (e.g., testing practices, testing schedule, inclusion of special populations) for all persons involved in the process.**	School/district leadership conducts a meeting with test administrators and provides copies of administrative and ethics procedures for the state assessment program.	School/district leadership distributes copies of administration and ethics procedures of the state assessment program to the staff.
	School/district leadership monitors the implementation of the policies and operational procedures that address the state's assessment and accountability system.	**The local school board adopts policies, and school and district leadership implement operational procedures that address the state's assessment and accountability system.**	The local school board addresses the state's assessment and accountability system in their policies or operational procedures, but the policies and procedures are not implemented.	The local school board does not have policies or operational procedures that address the state's assessment and accountability system.
	School/district leadership develops a testing schedule and communicates that schedule and comprehensive information explaining the purposes of assessment to staff members, students, parents/family members and community members.	**School/district leadership develops a testing schedule and communicates that schedule and comprehensive information that explains the purposes of assessment to staff members, parent/ family members and students.**	School/district leadership provides general information, but few details, about the purposes of assessment or the testing schedule to teachers and students.	School/district leadership provides no information about the assessment.
	School/district leadership supports teachers in their efforts to seamlessly integrate the use of assessment accommodations for individual students into the instructional program of eligible students.	**Assessment accommodations for individual students follow state regulations.**	Assessment accommodations for individual students do not always follow state regulations.	Assessment accommodations for individual students are not provided, or are provided for ineligible students.

Indicator	Ratings of Performance			
	4 Exemplary level of development and implementation	**3** Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation	**2** Limited development or partial implementation	**1** Little or no development and implementation
2.1h **Samples of student work are analyzed to inform instruction, revise curriculum and pedagogy and obtain information on student progress.** **Examples of Supporting Evidence:** • Staff member and student interviews • Samples of classroom assessments • Student working folders/portfolios • Results of analysis of student work • Student Performance Level Descriptions • Documentation of professional development days/release time	**Meets criteria for a rating of "3" on this indicator plus:**			
	All teachers are proficient in and consistently implement the use of protocols for analyzing student work across all content areas and grade levels.	**Teachers have received training in and regularly implement protocols for analyzing student work across all content areas and grade levels.**	Some teachers have received training in protocols for analyzing student work in some content areas and grade levels, but the protocols are not always implemented.	Teachers have not received training in protocols for analyzing student work.
	Student work is regularly analyzed by teachers and students using performance level descriptions. The results of this analysis are applied to inform curricular decision-making and to make connections within and beyond the implemented curriculum.	**Student work is regularly analyzed by teachers and students using performance level descriptions. The results of this analysis consistently inform teaching and learning.**	Student work is occasionally analyzed, but results of the analysis do not consistently impact teaching and learning.	Student work is not analyzed.
	Teachers collaborate across all content areas and grade levels to analyze student work to inform and revise instruction, curriculum, pedagogy and classroom assessment and to enhance student achievement.	**Teachers collaborate within content areas and/or grade levels to analyze student work to inform and revise instruction, curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.**	Some teachers analyze student work to revise instruction, curriculum and assessment.	Teachers do not analyze the student work to impact and revise instruction, curriculum and assessment.
	Students complete culminating performances as a demonstration of their growth over time, in accordance with their individual learning plan.	**Teachers use student profiles and/or portfolios in all content areas as a way to measure student growth over time, and implement individual learning plans.**	Some teachers use student profiles and/or portfolios as a way to measure student growth over time.	Student profiles and/or portfolios are not used to measure student growth over time.